



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,210	03/08/2001	Janez Skubic	P14024US2	8563
27045	7590	11/30/2011	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2453	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2011	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com  
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com  
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 09/803,210	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SKUBIC ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b> AZIZUL CHOUDHURY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2453

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 01 November 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  
NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-37.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not deemed fully persuasive. The applicant's principle argument focuses on the claim limitation of generating a representation of a document to be signed and forwarding it to a personal trusted device wherein the representation comprises from a group consisting of a document title, document number/id and author/name id. The applicant contends that neither prior art teaches such a claim feature, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Proudler teaches the trusted device signing (which is unique to the user; see column 6, lines 49-50, Proudler) a document (contract, text or pic or etc; see column 6, lines 14-19, Proudler) in a manner unique to the user; see column 6, lines 37-56, Proudler. Hence a document can be displayed entirely as claimed. While Proudler teaches a trusted component (personal trusted device), Proudler does not explicitly cite the claimed representation being sent to the trusted component (personal trusted device). In the same field of endeavor, Wang also teaches a portable authorization device, also called the PEAD (personal trusted device). Within Wang's disclosure, it is taught how encrypted forms of the data (representations) are sent (since they are sent, inherently they are created) to the PEAD; see column 7, lines 18-28, Wang. The encrypted forms of data contain user identification or other identification (document/author/name id/number). While the applicant contends that the "representation" of the document is not the entire document, the claim language does not distinguish such a detail. In other words, if the claim said "a portion" or "a part of the document", those descriptions accurately describe a portion or part of a document. However, a "representation" of a document can be read as being another form of the document. As such it was read as an encrypted form of the document, such as that taught by Wang. Finally, the applicant contends that the claim claims the entire document and the representation of the document are displayed simultaneously. However, the applicant should note that such a feature is not claimed. In fact, at least the independent claims fail to mention the term "simultaneous". For these reasons, the arguments are not deemed fully persuasive.